

Board of Trustees
December 2, 1965

Present: C. Willard Heckel, President, Presiding: Francis Quillan, James A. Pawley, Louis Pitts, Louis R. Quad, Andrew Washington, Rabbi Jonathan J. Prinz, Sidney Reitman, Arthur Kaufman for Mayor Hugh J. Addonizio, Thomas F. Edwards, James E. Abrams, Mrs. Gloria Butler, Timothy Still, Edward A. Kirk, George J. Haney, Kenneth A. Gibson, Msgr. Thomas J. Carey, William D. Payne, Charles W. Garrison, Mrs. Ceil Arons, Irving Rosenberg, Oscar Stafford, Zain Matos, Rev. Kinmoth W. Jefferson, Frank Luria, Ralph T. Geller, Willie Wright, Mrs. Reynold B. Burch, Miss Hilda Hidalgo, Duke E. Moore, Sr., Fred E. Means.

Guests: Harry G. McDowell, Raymond Stabile, Edward Kilduff, Mrs. Fredericka Ingham, Walter Dawkins, Mrs. Helen Winters, Mr. Partenheimer, Mrs. Peggy Casey.

Staff: Cyril D. Tyson, Donald M. Wendell, James Blair, Albert Alba, P. Miranda, E. Conway, Fleming Jones, Charles Settles, Norman Steinlauf, James Walker, Francis Warren, Emil Hirschoff, Dean Harrison, Raphael Lozado, Carol Popot, William Daniels, Mrs. Beatrice V. Easley

The meeting was held in Area Board I, Project: Concern, 193 Central Avenue.

REPORT OF PERSONNEL COMMITTEE: Mr. Kirk reported for the Personnel Committee on the revised Salary Schedule. He **MOVED ADOPTION** of the Salary Schedule as presented. The **MOTION WAS SECONDED.** After some discussion the revised Salary Schedule was **ADOPTED** as presented. (attached to the minutes.)

REPORT OF BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE: Mr. Quillan, in the absence of Dr. Reynolds, Chairman of the Budget and Finance Committee, presented a report and the budget which is a continuation of UCC's first conduct and administration grant. Mr. Quillan **MOVED ADOPTION** of the budget. The **MOTION WAS SECONDED.** (The report is attached hereto.)

In the discussion that followed Mr. McDowell explained that he and Mr. Parker abstained from voting on the budget but not because they were against it. He said the document is a very fine one and many changes have been made in the budget. They felt it would be unfair to themselves and UCC to vote against it and equally unfair to vote for it.

After more discussion the **BUDGET WAS ADOPTED**
BY MAJORITY VOTE.

**PRE-ELDERLY TRAINING
PROGRAM:**

Mr. Dawkins presented the report for the Special Projects Task Force and Program Committee and recommended adoption of the proposal. The recommendation was SO MOVED, SECONDED AND PASSED.

**SENIOR CITIZENS HEALTH
AND RECREATION PROJECT
FOR NEWARK:**

Mr. Dawkins presented the report for the Special Projects Task Force and Program Committee and recommended adoption of the proposal. The recommendation was SO MOVED, SECONDED.

Mr. Still MOVED TO AMEND THE MOTION to strike from proposal the words "on welfare". The AMENDMENT WAS SECONDED. The MOTION AS AMENDED WAS ADOPTED.

**NEWARK BLOCK REHABILITATION
DEMONSTRATION
PROJECT:**

Mrs. Butler reported the Community Action Task Force and Program Committee recommended adoption of this proposal. However, she would like the proposal to be referred back to the sponsoring agency in order to get guarantees there will be no rent increase as a result of renovation. She MOVED the proposal be sent back to the sponsoring agency to get clarification on possible rent increase and a guarantee rent will not be increased. The MOTION WAS SECONDED. The President RULED THE MOTION WAS OUT OF ORDER since both the Program Committee and the Community Action Task Force had recommended approval.

It was then MOVED and SECONDED TO ACCEPT the proposal. In the discussion that followed questions were raised about getting the proposal funded under other means than community action funds; whether or not the Housing Authority should be involved in the program; have the landlords been living up to the present housing codes; were the tenants who live in the area involved in the drawing up of the proposal and are they in favor of it; would it be possible to get the landlords to sign an agreement not to raise the rent after renovation. As a result of these questions, and the fact that no representatives were present to answer questions, it WAS MOVED TO DEFER ACTION and the proposal be referred back to the sponsoring agency so that they can meet with the Program Committee and Community Action Task Force to clear up some of these questions. The MOTION WAS SECONDED AND PASSED BY MAJORITY VOTE.

Rev. Jefferson suggested that guidelines should be established in relation to programs approved by UCC since the amount of money available under community action programs for Newark

is limited. Dean Heckel said that the Program Committee will take this suggestion into consideration and will recommend policy to the Board.

**TEACHER AIDE
PROPOSAL:**

Mrs. Helen Winters, Co-Chairman of the Education Task Force reported on the Teacher Aide Proposal and said that the Board of Education is considering the recommendations previously made and will meet with the Program Committee and Education Task Force in the near future. She therefore recommended the proposal be deferred. Upon **MOTION MADE, AND SECONDED IT WAS VOTED** to defer action.

PROJECT ENABLE:

Mrs. Butler reported that the Program Committee and Community Action Task Force recommended approval of Project Enable and she so **MOVED**. The **MOTION WAS SECONDED**.

In response to a question as to why this proposal is to be funded out of community action, Mr. Tyson said that the broad administrative approach of this proposal had been funded nationally out of community action funds and, therefore, presented to us for funding through this act.

The **QUESTION WAS CALLED TO TERMINATE DEBATE AND WAS PASSED**. THE **MOTION WAS PASSED BY MAJORITY VOTE**. Mr. Moore objected to calling the question to cut off discussion.

**SPECIAL MEMBERSHIP
MEETING:**

Dean Heckel announced that a special membership meeting would be held on Thursday, January 20, 1966, at Temple B'nai Abraham and said that the notice would be sent out in accordance with the requirement stated in the By-Laws.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Beatrice V. Easley
Beatrice V. Easley

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Trustees DATE: December 2, 1965

FROM: Edward A. Kirk and Walter Chambers

SUBJECT: Report to Board of Trustees on UCC Salary Schedule

On September 16, 1965, the Board of Trustees approved a salary schedule which has been found unsatisfactory in terms of adjustments and in providing for a smooth and orderly operation and process. The Budget and Finance Committee of UCC recommended to the Personnel Committee that a new salary schedule with related procedures be prepared. Therefore, we have come again to the Board with a revised schedule as of November 26, 1965 which we believe more adaptable to the operations of UCC. We believe it is fair and reasonable as well as orderly in its process. A brief explanation of the schedule is certainly in order.

I. We have increased the number of grades from 15 in the old schedule to 28 presently. This has been done in order to more fairly provide for minimum-maximum ranges for new positions created within our present budget or for future positions which might be created. I want to point out that not all of these grades will be filled at this time (check Part 3 Position Summary).

II. In the revised salary schedule we have listed two levels-

- Level 1 - Executive and/or Professional Staff from grades 1 through 23
- Level 2 - Administrative and/or Clerical Staff from grades 24 to 28

III. We took the maximum salary from the old schedule and rounded the figure off to the nearest \$1,000 and \$500 bracket. That figure now becomes step #5 in our new schedule. For level 1 jobs we took 70% of that figure to constitute our minimum which now will become for each grade the salary base figure. From there we divided the salary into five annual steps reaching from minimum to maximum. These would represent possible merit increases on an annual basis. The only difference in Level 2 salaries is that we took 75% of the maximum figure, step #5 and that figure again constituted the salary base. We did this in Level 2 jobs so that we could get a better increment break for the lower salaried group.

In summary, may I again point out that this schedule is a proposed index for suggested merit increases over a five year span and it will be used as a guide toward salary payments for new employees. It is only fair to assume that both new and other employees in working for

the UCC would want to know what to expect in later years in terms of salary increments for satisfactorily accomplishing a particular job. I might mention that the training salary, Column 1, may be used for a candidate hired as a salary base minimum when it is determined that a 90 day training period is required before the successful candidate can perform the complete job.

Mr. Chairman, I would move the adoption of this Salary Schedule and related procedures.

REPORT OF THE BUDGET & FINANCE COMMITTEE, UCC

December 2, 1965

The Budget & Finance Committee reports herewith to the Board of Trustees of the United Community Corporation on its analysis of the "1966 Operating Budget" prepared by the Executive Director and staff. The budget is in three parts: (1) Central Administration, (2) Community Action, (3) Community Action Institute.

The Budget & Finance Committee has made a careful evaluation of the budget proposals. The evaluation has been solely in terms of the reasonableness and appropriateness of the proposed items for carrying out the UCC programs proposed. The evaluation does not reflect the judgment of the Budget & Finance Committee, or of its individual members, as to the merits of the various programs and activities of the UCC for 1966. Program evaluation is a function of another committee and ultimately of the Board of Trustees itself. I do not mean to imply by this any reservations on the part of the Budget & Finance Committee. I merely point out that program is not within our sphere.

You will note from the budget copies before you that the total budget figure is \$1,519,535. This figure is shown at the bottom of column 5 of the recap sheet, the column headed "1966 Budget Request". It is the total of the amounts for the three separate pieces - Central Administration, Community Action, and Community Action Institute. The budget amount for each of these separately is also shown in the budgets before you. There are page numbers shown on the upper right hand corners of the pages. Pages numbered CA 1A through CA 15 are the Central Administration budget. It totals \$605,148. Following these are pages numbered COMA 1A through COMA 19. These are the Community Action budget. It totals \$686,711. Lastly there are pages numbered CAI 1A through CAI 15. These are the budget for the Community Action Institute. They total \$227,676. These three figures added together total \$1,519,535, which is the total budget.

This budget, which this Board is asked to approve tonight, is a long, detailed document. Obviously we cannot go over it item by item tonight, although I will be glad to attempt to answer any questions you may have. I would like to make a few comments at this point.

The largest item in the budget, as with most budgets, is salaries. They represent some \$777,000, or just over half of the budget. The budget contemplates a staff, for all three parts, of 164 people. The salaries proposed for the various positions are all shown in the budget. They are consistent with the salary schedule you have just approved. Of the 164 proposed positions, 147, or 90%, carry salaries of less than \$10,000 a year. And 123 of them, or approximately 75%, provide salaries of less than \$6,000 a year.

There is also a sizable figure, \$208,662, for the purchase and rental of equipment. Much of this is a first year, one-time cost for furniture and equipment for the new people it is proposed to hire. The equipment items are geared to permit the UCC to reach as many people in this city as possible, and to bring to Newark all the advantages that modern technology can provide. They contemplate that the UCC will operate with up-to-date systems and procedures and are consistent with our philosophy that the UCC will provide the best possible service in order to obtain the best possible results in the anti-poverty effort.

For purposes of determining the local 10% share of the budget, and 10% comes to some \$152,000, the Budget and Finance Committee notes that this figure may overstate the amount of cash required to be raised locally. The local share may be provided either in cash or in kind--that is, by the provision of services or equipment. How it is to be raised remains to be determined, but that question does not need to be settled before the budget is adopted.

I do want to say at this time that in the preparation of this budget for you the Budget and Finance Committee has had long meetings with Messrs. McDowell and Parker of the city administration. These two gentlemen have been most helpful to us, and from our discussions with them have come substantial reductions in the budget from the figures originally contemplated. These reductions total something over \$240,000. I would like to tell you something about them. They do not involve any changes in the programs proposed or in the number of people to be hired. They do put our budget in a form more consistent with the municipal budget, whereas previously it was prepared more along the lines of Federal budgets. The changes fall into three categories:

1. On new positions, if we proposed to hire a new employee for, say, \$6,000 a year, the way the budget was formerly prepared there would have been \$6,000 in the budget for this position. Now, the way the budget has been revised, if we expect that in practice the new employee will not actually go on the payroll until, say, April 1 of 1966, the budget will show only \$4,500 for him -- that is, three quarters of a year's salary because he'll only be on the payroll for three quarters of 1966. Since there are 117 new positions, this has reduced the budget considerably. We had prepared the budget on the other basis originally because Federal budgets, I understand, are prepared that way, and we had expected that this reduction the budget now reflects would be brought about when the people in Washington considered our budget proposal. This is the normal practice. However, I think the changes you see reflected before you are a real improvement.

2. Salaries for proposed new positions are now budgeted at what we realistically think we can hire the new people for, instead of at the salary maximum for the job. Again, this is in line with municipal practice rather than Federal practice.
3. We have modified salary budget figures to conform to the new salary schedule you have just approved.

The Budget & Finance Committee, at its last meeting approved the budget you have before you. It was adopted without a dissenting vote, Messrs. McDowell and Parker, who were present at the meeting, abstained from voting. I wish that these two gentlemen could have been here to state their positions for themselves, but they had another engagement which prevented their coming. However, I think I state their position accurately, as they stated it at our meeting, when I say that they abstained from voting not because they oppose our program but because they felt that it would be inappropriate for them to vote on the budget because they are financial officers of the city,

I want to make just one other point. This budget differs in one important respect from a municipal budget or a budget for a business corporation. The UCC has no taxing authority, as the city has, and no source of funds, as a business organization has, except for Federal and local contributions. Therefore the budget is not a commitment to spend money. It is a statement of needs, to be submitted to Washington as the basis of our request for funds.

Your budget & Finance Committee recommends the budget to you for approval and adoption by the Board of Trustees. If you have any questions, we will be glad to try to answer them.

s/s

Francis S. Quillan, Treasurer
For the Budget & Finance Committee